

profit. We added the greater of the actual value for SG&A or the statutory minimum of 10 percent of the cost of materials and fabrication, in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. Where the actual profit was less than the statutory minimum of eight percent of the sum of materials, labor, direct and indirect overhead, and SG&A, we added the statutory minimum.

Where applicable, we made adjustments for commissions, indirect selling expenses, credit, and differences in packing costs. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

#### Best Information Available

Because we received no questionnaire responses from Tzitzic Tareta, Alisitos, Mision el Descanso, Las Flores, and Mexipel, we have determined that they are uncooperative respondents. As a result, in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, we have determined that the use of BIA is appropriate. Whenever, as here, a company refuses to cooperate with the Department, or otherwise significantly impedes an antidumping proceeding, we use as BIA the higher of (1) the highest of the rates found for any firm for the same class or kind of merchandise in the same country of origin in the LTFV investigation or in prior administrative reviews; or (2) the highest rate found in this review for any firm for the same class or kind of merchandise. (See Antifriction Bearings from France, et. al; Final Results of Review, 58 FR 39729 (July 26, 1993).) As BIA, we assigned the rate of 39.95 percent, which is the second highest rate found for any Mexican flower producer from the prior reviews and the LTFV investigation. We have selected this rate because the highest rate found for any Mexican flower producer in prior reviews and the LTFV investigation, 264.43 percent, is not representative.

This rate was due to a company's extraordinarily high business expenses during the review period resulting from investment activities which were uncharacteristic of the other reviewed companies. Therefore, we found it inappropriate to use this rate as BIA, both in prior reviews and in this review. (See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico, 56 FR 29621, 29623 (June 28, 1991).)

#### Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period April 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Visaflor .....	10.00
Rancho Daisy .....	10.00
Rancho del Pacifico .....	0.00
Rancho el Toro .....	0.00
Rancho Guacatay .....	0.00
Rancho Aguaje .....	1.54
Mexipel, S.A. de CV .....	39.95
Tzitzic Tareta .....	39.95
Rancho Alisitos .....	39.95
Rancho Mision el Descanso .....	39.95
Las Flores de Mexico .....	39.95

<sup>1</sup> No shipments subject to this review. Rate is from the last relevant segment of the proceeding in which the firm had shipments.

We have preliminarily determined not to revoke the antidumping order with regard to Guacatay, Toro, and Aguaje, because they preliminarily received a non-de minimis dumping margin in the 1991-92 review. If those results become final, these producers will not be eligible for revocation in this review because they will not have three consecutive reviews with zero margins.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing will be held 44 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the publication date of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the result of its analysis of issues raised in any such case briefs.

The following deposit requirements shall be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies shall be those rates established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate shall be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review, the cash deposit rate will be 18.28

percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: September 15, 1995.  
Susan G. Esserman,  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-23789 Filed 9-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510DS-P

#### [A-428-801]

#### Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From Germany; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of amended final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

**SUMMARY:** On February 28, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof (AFBs) from France et al. (including Germany) (60 FR 10900). Pursuant to instructions issued by the Court of International Trade (CIT) on July 26, 1995, we have corrected two errors with respect to AFBs from Germany sold by FAG Kugelfischer Georg Schaefer KgaA (FAG). There errors were present in our first amended final results of review, which were published on June 13, 1995. The reviews cover the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993. The "classes or kinds" of merchandise covered by these reviews are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs),

cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof (CRBs), and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof (SPBs).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 26, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Kris Campbell or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On February 28, 1995, the Department published the final results of antidumping duty administrative review, partial termination, and revocation in part of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, et al. (60 FR 10900). The review period is May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993. The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these reviews are BBs CRBs, and SPBs. For a detailed description of the products covered under these classes or kinds of merchandise, including a compilation of all pertinent scope determinations, see the "Scope Appendix" of the final results referenced above.

On May 3, 1995, the CIT ordered the Department to correct four ministerial errors in the final results with respect to AFBs from Germany sold by FAG. On June 13, 1995, we amended our final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty orders on AFBs from Germany and Italy with respect to FAG. On July 26, 1995, the CIT ordered the Department to correct two additional errors and to publish a second amended *Final Results* incorporating these corrections.

The CIT ordered the Department to make the following corrections to its analysis for FAG Germany: (1) reinstate 1992 sales made to those customers to whom rebates were granted in 1992 and remove 1993 sales made to the one U.S. customer for whom corporate rebates were reported (prior to applying the BIA rate to 1993 sales) and to reinstate these 1993 sales in the total U.S. sales database; and 2) subtract other discounts (OTHDISE) from the reported unit price (UNITPRE) prior to applying the BIA rate to UNITPRE.

We have corrected these errors in FAG's margin calculations for the amended final results of review and have determined that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993:

Manu- facturer/ exporter	Country	BBs	CRBs	SPBs
FAG ....	Germany	10.40	13.79	14.61

Based on these results, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with the procedures discussed in the final results of these reviews. These deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This amendment of final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(f) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(f)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: September 15, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,  
*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-23891 Filed 9-25-95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M**

**[A-201-601]**

**Fresh Cut Flowers From Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On April 17, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Mexico. The period of review is April 1, 1991 through March 31, 1992.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We have not

changed our preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 26, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Rebecca Trainor or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On April 17, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 19209) the preliminary results of this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Mexico (52 FR 13491, April 23, 1987). The preliminary results indicated the existence of dumping margins for three of the respondents in this review, Rancho El Aguaje (Aguaje), Rancho Guacatay (Guacatay), and Rancho El Toro (Toro), based on the best information available (BIA). The fourth respondent, Visaflor S. de P.R. (Visaflor), had no shipments to the United States during the period of review.

Aguaje, Guacatay, Toro, and the petitioner, the Floral Trade Council, submitted case and rebuttal briefs. A public hearing was held on May 31, 1995. The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

**Applicable Statutes and Regulations**

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statutes and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

**Scope of the Review**

The products covered by this review are certain fresh cut flowers, defined as standard carnations, standard chrysanthemums, and pompon chrysanthemums. During the POR, such merchandise was classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) item numbers 0603.10.7010 (pompon chrysanthemums), 0603.10.7020 (standard chrysanthemums), and 0603.10.7030 (standard carnations). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the order.

This review covers sales of the subject merchandise manufactured by Aguaje, Guacatay, Toro, and Visaflor, and entered into the United States during